DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 872 FL 025 372

AUTHOR	Martinovic-Zic, Aida
TITLE	You Are What You Speak: Language Choice in Bilinguals as a Strategy in Power Relations.
PUB DATE	1998-03-00
NOTE	39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (20th, Seattle, WA, March 14-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adults; *Code Switching (Language); *English (Second Language); Ethnic Groups; Ethnicity; *Interpersonal Relationship; Language Attitudes; *Language Dominance; Language Patterns; Language Research; *Language Role; Language Usage; Power Structure; Self Concept; Sociocultural Patterns; *Sociolinguistics; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Bilinguals

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the ways in which a bilingual's choice between the minority first language (L1) and the dominant second language (L2), in this case English, suggests the value the language has for the social and in-group identity of the bilingual. Adult bilinguals (n=38) of widely varying L1 backgrounds were surveyed concerning their language dominance, ethnolinguistic group enclosure, perceived social comparison to the L2 group, social contact/networking, and attitude toward the L2. Responses suggest bilinguals' strategies in choosing a language are socially conditioned in at least two ways: (1) there is a functional dependence on one or the other language in the relevant communicative contexts, and (2) in the L2-dominant society the relative tension between the perceived sociolinguistic power of L1 and L2 will lead a bilingual in language choice. When the dominant L2 is seen as competing with or undermining the value of L1, the L1 minority mobilizes the forces of its ingroup identity by choosing L1 as its crucially important attribute. It is concluded that as the tension in power relations between L1 and L2 moves along the sociocultural continuum, so does possible accommodation to L2, its acceptance, anticipated social benefits from choosing it, and possibly, its successful learning. A language use survey is appended. (Contains 19 references.) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 872

Aida Martinovic-Zic
Department of English
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI 53201
(414) 229- 6180
e-mail: aidam@csd.uwm.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Aida Martinovic-Zic

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

You are what you speak: language choice in bilinguals as a strategy in power relations

A bilingual's language choice or code-switching strategy depends on the (conscious or unconscious) assessment of the relationship with the interlocutor within a particular social context (Gumperz 1976, Beebe and Zuengler 1983, Schumann 1976, 1978). Similar to Schumann's acculturation model (1978), two models in social psychology treat the choice of language or style as resulting from the speaker's evaluation of the interlocutor in a social context: speech accommodation model (Giles and Smith (1979), Giles and St.Clair (1985), Giles and Byrne (1982), Beebe and Giles (1984), and the related inter-group model (Giles and Byrne 1982). Based on these two models, this paper discusses the ways in which a choice between a minority language (first language=L1) and the dominant language (second language=L2) suggests the value the language has for the social and in-group identity of a bilingual speaker.

The paper reports results obtained on a survey conducted among 38 adult bilinguals in Milwaukee, Wisconsin of the following L1 backgrounds: Russian, Hmong, Laotian, Chinese, Japanese, Malay, Serbo-Croatian, Indonesian, Korean, Polish, and Somali. Mean age of the respondents is 24, while their mean age of arrival in the US is 18. The survey consists of 31 multiple-choice questions, grouped and evaluated within five categories: **(1)** subjects' language dominance; **(2)** ethno-linguistic group enclosure; **(3)** perceived social comparison to L2 group; **(4)** social contact/networking, and **(5)** attitude toward L2.

The responses on this survey study suggest that bilinguals' strategies in choosing the language are socially conditioned in at least two ways. One is the functional dependence on one or the other language in the relevant communicative contexts. The other is that in the L2 dominant society the relative tension between the perceived socio-linguistic power of L1 and L2 will lead a bilingual in language choice. Based on the social value of L1 or L2 in different contexts, a minority bilingual chooses to converge to L2 or diverge from it, maintaining L1 or switching between the codes while preserving L1 or L2 as base language. When the dominant L2 is seen as competing with or undermining the value of L1, L1 minority mobilizes the forces of its ingroup identity by choosing L1 as its crucially important attribute.

It is concluded that as the tension in power relations between L1 and L2 moves along the socio-cultural continuum, so does the possible accommodation to L2, its acceptance, anticipated social benefits from choosing it, and, possibly, its successful learning.

FL025372

You Are What You Speak:
Language Choice in Bilinguals as a Strategy in Power Relations

Aida Martinovic-Zic
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

In a variety of social contexts, appropriate language markers constitute a desired norm of communication by which the participants in the speech situation abide. Appropriateness of such language features is context-specific and based on the participants' perceptions of the contextual norm, i.e., their knowledge of and sensitivity to the interactional rules specific to the situation. While language always serves some communicative function, its appropriate form is not motivated only by the communicative function per se. On a continuum of language variation, other socio-cultural factors are manifested in the levels of formality, registers, genres, and, generally, different 'lects' of language use. Together, these contextual factors and the corresponding linguistic features indicate that language is molded as much as preserved in every instance of language use. In the background of every communicative act lies the participants' awareness of their social identities and demands of a speech situation, even if an utterly schematic one (e.g. greetings, formulaic requests, apologies, invitations, expressions of gratitude, congratulations, etc). As a result, lexical choice, phrasing, syntax, tone, or intonation which is appropriate in one situation may be inadequate in another.

The significance of contextual factors for the choice of linguistic norm becomes even more transparent when a speaker has to choose between two languages. While communicative function leads a bilingual in choosing the language of interaction, it doesn't cover all the social needs fulfilled by language choice in different contexts. Depending on

the social circumstances, language carries socio-symbolic meaning for the speaker and represents his/her evaluation of the hearer, of the speaker's own role/position in the verbal exchange, as well as of the speech situation as a whole. These evaluations often motivate a bilingual to choose one language over the other, to switch strategically at specific points during the exchange, or to mix the languages less predictably when speaking to another bilingual of the same language background. Language choice, then, becomes a symbol of one's social identity, of the individual's need to be heard, acknowledged, and positively evaluated by others. What one says is shaped by how one says it.

As a result, a bilingual chooses his/her first language (L1) or a second language (L2), or mixes the two based on the (conscious or unconscious) assessment of the relationship with the interlocutor within a context. Some important factors which come into play are : ethnicity, costs/rewards in the social exchange, assessed interlocutor's motivations/causes for a certain type of behavior (Beebe and Zuengler 1983), ingroup vs. outgroup feelings toward interlocutor (Gumperz's (1976) 'we' code vs. 'they' code), perceived social distance from the interlocutor (power of or over the addressee), and perceived solidarity with the interlocutor (presumed closeness, intimacy, or equality).

Two mutually related social psychological models developed by Giles and his collaborators approach choice of language or style from the perspective of the speaker in evaluating the interlocutor (Giles and Smith 1979, Giles and St Clair 1985, Giles and Byrne, 1982). According to speech accomodation model, many socio-cognitive reasons motivate the speaker to accomodate his/her speech to the speech of the hearer, or to decide not to accomodate, maintaining the initially chosen language/style or diverging

from the addressee. The inter-group model views speech accomodation in terms of inter-group dynamics and social comparison between groups. Language is regarded an important component of ingroup identification. "A certain speech style or language can often be a necessary attribute for membership for a particular ethnic group, a salient cue for inter-ethnic categorisation, an important dimension of ethnic identity, and an ideal medium for facilitating intragroup cohesion " (Giles and Byrne, 1982 17). For a bilingual group member, 'we' code may represent an identity symbol in comparison to 'they' code, which marks a shift toward outgroup identification and a partial or a complete loss of a strong ingroup identity.

In a bilingual (or multilingual) socio-cultural setting, then, attitudinal evaluation of one language as opposed to the other will depend on the perceived status of the language within and outside a group, which, in turn, reflects in the choice of L1 or L2 as an identification marker in intergroup relations. Based on the two briefly outlined theoretical models in social psychology, this paper discusses the ways in which a bilingual's choice between a minority language (L1) and the dominant language (L2) reflects the value each language has for the social identity and the ingroup identity of its speaker. As a pilot study on the interaction among patterns of language use, language attitudes and language choice, the paper reports results from a survey conducted among adult bilinguals in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The respondents' native language (L1) is a minority language in respect to their second language, English (L2), the majority language of the society in which they live.

Responses indicate that, in addition to being functionally motivated, the choice of L1 or L2 for a bilingual of this socio-linguistic profile, depends on the value assigned to the language (L1 or L2) as an instrument of ingroup and intergroup dynamics. Positive intergroup comparison of the L1 group to the dominant L2 group co-occurs with a positive attitude toward and acceptance of L2 and its culture. In contrast, when L1 group is evaluated as negatively perceived or threatened by L2 culture, the group's attitude toward L2 and culture is less favorable and reveals the desire to preserve L1 and strong ingroup bonds. Although there seems to be a generational effect on the bilinguals' willingness to integrate into L2 culture, responses show that the young generation assimilates faster, but doesn't automatically give up on its L1 identity. More interestingly, the status that L1 has for its speakers determines the attitude toward assimilation regardless of age. Finally, survey results also have potential implications for more-or-less native-like L2 learning in the L2-dominant context.

1. Introduction : Ethno-linguistic identity and language attitudes

It is a well-known fact that many social stereotypes have their origin in the way a person or, for that matter, a particular social group, speaks. On a continuum of speech evaluations from very positive to very negative, language stereotyping is often identified with general stereotyping about those whose speech is being evaluated. Speech markers, such as accent, intonation, vocabulary, or syntactic structure, characterize a speaker, monolingual or bilingual, as a member of a group whose speech is marked by the same features. As a result, attitudes toward language markers often reveal attitudes toward the group as a whole. While among monolinguals these attitudes depend on the evaluative

norms related to dialect, style, register, or slang, bilinguals evaluate and are evaluated on the basis of one of the two languages they speak. Romaine (1995) notes

> In many cases bilingualism is viewed negatively and with suspicion. Members of the bilingual community often share the negative attitudes of monolinguals, often to the point where they discourage their children from using the language of the home, when this is different from the one used in society at large
> (1995: 288).

In matched-guise experiments, researchers have tested the attitudes people have toward the same person when speaking a different language. Lambert et al. (1960), conducted a study in Montreal, Canada, and found that reactions toward English/French guises depended on the language they spoke more than on the native language of the evaluators. Using evaluative categories such as 'good/bad', 'friendly/unfriendly', 'educated/uneducated', both English-speaking and French-speaking judges evaluated the same person more positively on most traits when he/she spoke English rather than French (qtd. in Edwards 1982:22). As noted by Romaine (1995), similar findings have become typical in this type of research, confirming "that the minority often accept the stigma attached to their way of speaking by the socially dominant majority " (1995:189).

Similar results have been obtained on monolingual language attitude studies in social psychology. In Britain, Giles and Powesland (1975, qtd. in Graddol and Swann 1989: 58) found that speakers of standard British English (RP=Received Pronunciation) were evaluated differently from the speakers of a regional dialect. Interestingly, however, a positive/negative dichotomy couldn't be easily applied. Namely, even though speakers of high prestige RP standard were evaluated as more intelligent, competent, and educated, some other positive attributes were used to categorize speakers of the regional dialect as more sincere or likeable. These evaluations show that attitudes toward language markers

in speech may vary according to the complex set of symbolic features that such markers have for the evaluator. In other words, choice of typical linguistic features or a completely different language symbolizes some aspect of social identity of its speaker.

The importance of language for social identity is evident from the definitions of this socio-cognitive concept in the literature on social identity in social psychology. Drawing on research on social identity, Giles and Byrne (1982) say the following:

> This knowledge of our category memberships together with the values, positive or negative, associated with them, is defined as our social identity and has meaning only through social comparison with other social groups. Social identity forms an important part of the self-concept and it is proposed that we try to achieve a positive sense of social identity in such a way as to make our own social group distinct from other collectives on valued dimensions (eg. power, economic resources, intellectual attributes)
> (Giles and Byrne 1982:19)

If, as suggested by language attitude studies, the way one speaks influences the way one is looked upon, and, further, the way one wants to be looked upon serves as impetus for speaking, it is clear that language must be a critical component in one's self-actualization and "sense of one's own social worth " (Bourdieu 1991:82). The way one is socialized into using language and choosing one style, variety, or language rather than another has consequences for one's social self-evaluation and the way one is perceived by others. Since language at the same time reflects group membership/s of the speaker, it "can often be a necessary attribute for membership of a particular ethnic group, a salient cue for inter-ethnic categorisation, an important dimension of ethnic identity..." (Giles and Byrne 1982:17). In no other case can relevance of ethno-linguistic identity seem more obvious than when the ingroup language is completely different from the out-group one. The choice of ingroup or outgroup language by the ingroup member reveals the degree to

which ethno-linguistic identification is important to the speaker and deemed socially relevant visa vis the addressee.

Bilingual code-switching or mixing of the two languages supplies further evidence about an individual's closeness to or distance from his/her group along the ethnolinguistic dimension; sometimes, language choice/switch may be a sign of the speaker's successful manipulation of his/her ethnolinguistic identity aimed at winning the approval of the same ethnic group. Bourdieu's (1991:68) mayor of Pau who spoke his native dialect Béarnais to the audience of the same ethno-linguistic identity is an example of a strategic monolingual switch strengthening the ethnic ingroup feeling between the mayor and his addressees.

Both speech accomodation and intergroup models stress the importance of the speaker's need for positive comparison to and the social approval by the addressee (Giles and Smith 1979; Bell 1984). While speech accomodation theory emphasizes the individual speakers' accomodation of their speech to the hearer, intergroup theory (Giles and Byrne 1982) deals with language as an aspect of ingroup ethno-linguistic identity in comparison to other relevant outgroups. Giles's theoretical proposals have also been applied to language variation and language learning phenomena in second language acquisition (Beebe 1980, Beebe and Zuengler 1983, Beebe and Giles 1984, Giles and Byrne 1982).

Three theoretical concepts are significant in the style/language accomodation model: (a) convergence to the addressee, (b) maintenance of the speaker's style/language, and (c) divergence from the style/language of the hearer. When viewed as psychological phenomena in varying levels of bilingualism, the strategies of convergence and divergence "reflect the speaker's motivation to accomodate, rather than an ability to do so" (Beebe

and Giles 1984:23). However, these strategies are not absolute and straightforward in all interactions, they can be manipulated or used in other psychologically complex ways, depending on the speaker's anticipation of the hearer's evaluation of any one of them. For example, too much convergence may be interpreted as patronizing and divergence may not be disapproved of (Giles and Smith 1979, qtd. in Bell 1984:162).

In support of the speech accomodation model, Bell (1984:158) claims that "if a linguistic variable has no inter-speaker variation, it will have no intra-speaker variation", citing language learning, language loss, and bilingualism as evidence. When one takes the speaker's ethno-linguistic identity and language-related attitudes into account, it can be noted that in language contact situations or in bilingual language choice, both variation types operate simultaneously, each drawing on and feeding into the other. An individual's decision to speak L1 or L2 is dependent upon the interlocutor; additionally,the choice depends on the speaker's linguistic ability to speak the two languages, and the motivation to choose between them depends on the value such a choice has for the speaker's self-evaluation in a given situation. As a result, when two languages are in contact over a longer period of time, convergence leads to L1's shift toward L2 (approximation to L2 ; gradual loss of L1); divergence, on the other hand, contributes to substratum changes (development of L2 with L1 grammar), pidgins, and, eventually, creoles.

Giles's intergroup theory, together with other social-psychological models of second language acquistion (Gardner 1979, Clement 1980), relies on group factors such as "the strength of ethnic identification, notions of intergroup comparison, and the desire for the positively-valued ethnic distinctiveness" (Giles and Byrne 1982:26). Within the context

of second language acquisition, the intergroup model outlines intergroup conditions which influence acquisition of the dominant group's language (L2) by the minority L1 groups. According to the model, favorable L2 learning conditions exist when: (a) L1 ingroup identification is weak; (b) when L1 is not a salient group membership attribute; (c) when perceived ingroup vitality is low; (d) when in-group boundaries are soft and open; (e) when interethnic comparisons to L2 group are not marked by inferiority; and (f) when strong identification exists with many other social categories, each providing adequate group identities and intragroup status. All these factors indicate weak ingroup identity and a low ingroup member identification. In contrast, unfavorable L2 learning conditions are marked by opposite ingroup features, i.e. high in-group identification (Giles and Byrne 1984:34-5).

Based on the saliency that a minority L1 has for a bilingual's sense of ethno-linguistic identification, the bilingual's choice of L1 or the majority L2 will reflect power relations between 'we'code (L1) and 'they' code (L2) respectively. Power relations are created in the relative tension between the perceived socio-linguistic values/statuses that each of the two languages has for the speaker (L1 group member). This proposition sets forth a set of hypotheses for this survey study.

2. Hypotheses

2.1. Functional/instrumental language choice will be domain-motivated (L2 in L2 contexts/situations/topics; L1 in others).

2.2. The speaker's evaluation of L2 will depend on both its communicative and symbolic status with respect to L1. Such evaluation will manifest in the following ways:

(A) When L2 is the dominant language in the society, positively evaluated status of L2 will result in a shift toward L2 as well as in L2-based mixing (lexical/structural borrowing) in the use of L1.

Negatively evaluated status of L2 (as dominant at the expense of L1; or due to the lack of relevant out-group communication) will result in L1 maintenance or 'imperfect' L2 forms (e. g. pidginization, fossilization).

3. Method

The language attitude/use survey was conducted at three Milwaukee locations: the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, in the residential area of Shorewood, and, with the help from one respondent, in Milwaukee County. The survey was based on Schumann's aculturation model (1978) and Giles and Byrne's (1982) intergroup approach to second language learning and adapted from Hansen's (1989) study of the effect of acculturation model on second language acquisition. The questionnaire consists of 31 questions, 5 of which were aimed at general social categories: respondents' native language (L1), age, age of arrival in the US, education, occupational status, percentage of L1 or L2 language use related to occupational status (1-5). Out of the remaining 26 questions, 20 were close-ended (multiple-choice), whereas 6 were open-ended (questions on language mixing, reasons for/against L1 maintenance in family, and about multiple group memberships). Most close-ended questions had 4 subcomponents (a-d), ranging from 3 (a-c) to 7 (a-g) options.

The total number of respondents was 38 (n=38), of the following L1 backgrounds: Russian (n=10), Hmong (n=7), Laotian (n=4), Chinese (n=4), Japanese (n=3), Malay (n=3), Serbo-Croatian (n=3), Indonesian (n=1), Korean (n=1), Polish (n=1), Somali (n=1). 76 % of all respondents (n=29) are undergraduate students at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. 9 respondents (24 %) were from the residental areas in Shorewood and west Milwaukee (Russian n=5; Hmong n=4). The majority of the subjects (71 %) are long-term residents in the US (n=27), while the rest (n=11) are international students (29 %). While the respondents' bilingual L2 proficiency varies, most of them can be called developing bilinguals, or, alternatively, L2 learners. A very small number of respondents (approximately 10 %) are balanced bilinguals, with the same proficiency levels in both L1 and L2.

4. Procedure

In deciding what method of measurement to use in the analysis, I was confronted with two problems. One was that I wanted to analyze the answers on close-ended questions across the informants, following intergroup (Giles and Byrne 1982) and acculturation models (Schumann 1978). The other was that specific answers to open-ended questions, as well as some close-ended ones, demanded individual attention and that it seemed better to describe and compare them individually rather than across subjects. The fact that the survey targeted language evaluation, use, and attitude made it more difficult to formalize the analysis. My dilemma was confirmed in Romaine (1995), who says "The translation of the notion of 'attitude' from the subjective domain into something objectively measureable and therefore more easily comparable is a common problem in any

research that involves social categorization and perceptual judgements" (1995:288). As a result, I tabulated and compared answers to all questions across the informants qualitatively; the questions were categorized into five socio-linguistic variables described below. In addition, I focused on some individual questions, within and across variables, in order to analyze the effect they bear on the overall evaluation of the results. These responses are described in the Discussion of Results section, following the Results section; the latter presents the percentage break-down of responses on the proposed variables.

The received responses were used to measure and evaluate the following five **descriptive socio-linguistic variables** (see survey in **Appendix 1**):

1. Language Dominance

Questions: **6, 9, *25, *26**[1]

This set of responses was intended to evaluate the respondents' language dominance (L1 or L2-dominant bilingual) and communicative dominance (functional/domain-based dominance). The responses were relevant for Hypothesis 1.

2. Ethno-linguistic enclosure

Questions: **11, 12, 19, 20, 23, 29, *30**

The variable was meant to measure the respondents' L1 ingroup score, i.e. ingroup ethnolinguistic identity and value of L1.

3. Perceived social comparison to L2 group

Questions: ***7, *8, 10, 13, 16**[2]**, 17, 18, 21, 27, *28**

---

[1] *open-ended questions on domain-based language choice

[2] Schumann suggests that intended length of stay has a positive effect on L2 proficiency, but I don't find it a reliable variable since it doesn't necessarily correlate with increased proficiency in the L2. Degree of social need to use L2 and the positive/negative evaluation of it may have a greater effect on a developing

This variable targeted intergroup factors, such as congruence (socio-cultural similarity between L1 and L2), L1 group's integration strategies, and convergence to/divergence from L2.

4.Social contact/networking

Questions: **14, 15, *31**

The set of responses grouped under this variable was intended to evaluate the respondents' outgroup membership, i. e. the degree to which they have contacts outside of their L1 group/community.

5. Attitude toward L2

Questions: **22, 24**

This was an affective variable, evaluating the informants' feelings **about** L2.

Variables 2-5 were relevant for Hypothesis 2.

The responses were tabulated and compared across all informants, since all of them represent L1-minority speakers with respect to the L2-majority language (N = 38). Additionally, individual L1-group results obtained from the Russian and Hmong native speakers were compared separately. In doing the latter, I was guided by the different linguistic and cultural boundaries between these two L1 groups and the dominant L2 group, these have possibly led to differences in the social comparison to and the relative value assigned to L2. Furthermore, on the average, immigration conditions were different for Russian and Hmong residents in Milwaukee. The former group immigrated mainly for

---

bilingual rather than the length of time he/she spends in a L2-speaking country. However, for the purpose of the analysis, I include question 16 in this category, together with integration strategies.

economic reasons and in search of religious security (e.g. Russian Jewish immigrants), while the latter immigrated into the US primarily as after-war political refugees.

5. Results

A. General social categories:

Mean age	24 (60 yrs old=1; 15 yrs. old=1)
Mean age of arrival	18 (mostly 10-19 yrs of age, little or no English background; 1 subject =54; 3 subjects born in the US)
Occupational status	student: 32 computer programmer: 2 cashier at dept. store: 1 part-time dish-washer at Sandburg Hall: 1 babysitter: 1 office clerk/bank clerk: 4 supervisor (manufactoring company): 1 CNC machine operator: 1 cosmetologist: 1 architect: 1 medical researcher: 1 teaching assistant: 1 waitress: 1 manager (fast food restaurant): 1 flower designer: 1 appt. complex maintenance: 1
Language at work	English: 15 English/Hmong: 1 English/Laotian: 2 English/Russian: 2
education	Home country: average 10 yrs US: average 3 yrs

B. Descriptive Socio-Linguistic Variables

Tables 1-7 (See Appendix 2)

Table 1: Language Dominance

As it could have been expected from the bilingual profile of a greater number of respondents (developing bilinguals/L2 learners), most of them are L1-dominant judging by the answers on the average amount of speech in L1. Namely, 68 % of all respondents said

that 30-75 % of their speech is in their native language, while the remaining 32 % felt that the amount of speech in their native language is even higher: 75-100 %. These results indicate the respondents' L1 dominance, but also suggest the developmental bilingual trend in most informants, those who have chosen the 30-75 % response. (A small number of subjects deviated from this pattern, reversing the dominance to L2 (5 %), or dividing the % of speech between L1 and L2 (10 %). Since some respondents were American-born balanced bilinguals, these results fit the expected pattern of bilingual proficiency.)

The open-ended questions about the domains of L1/L2 use indicate subjects' functional orientation in language use. For instance, English (L2) is used at school, work, recreation centers/for sports, when going shopping, to solve house-related problems, to speak with American or international friends, to answer questions, make requests, use computers, or write email. Conversely, L1 is used in home-related conversations and activities, when speaking to family, cousins, L1 friends, with older people who cannot speak English well, in translation, at church, in international phone calls (when calling family), when studying with L1 friends, or for verbalization of emotions and thoughts. Some respondents said that they always use L1 when they are angry or sad/depressed, and one mentioned that he uses L1 in thinking.

Tables 2-4 (A through F): Ethno-linguistic Enclosure

Overall, ingroup identification for the majority of respondents is moderate to high, indicating a rather strong ethno-linguistic identity and L1 maintenance. However, results also indicate generational as well as individual differences in attitudes toward maintaing L1.

language and tradition, willingness to start a family outside of the L1 group, and in a generally positive attitude toward bilingualism (speaking both languages is better than speaking only one).

Questions 11, 12, and 23 were meant to measure the cohesiveness and boundary-strength of the informants' L1 group. However, the answers to questions about the relationship between social closeness/intimacy and L1 ingroup identity (11 and 12) may be the result of the social position of L1 group within the dominant L2 society, as much as L1-group's tight ingroup boundaries. In part, then, results on these questions may be interpreted as L1 group's lack of other social choices relevant for proximity/closeness. The greatest percentage of respondents (63 %) socialize with either people from their native culture (choice b.), or mostly with people from their native culture, and some Americans (choice c.). To 82 % of all respondents best friends are people from their native country. According to the responses to question 23, about a half of all respondents are already married to a person from the same L1 group, or would marry someone from the L1 country or an American-born from the same L1 group (58 %). Interestingly, however, (35 %) said they had no preference in choosing their future spouse.

Questions 19 and 20 elicited responses about the maintenance of L1 and tradition. Results on question 19 show a generational divide between maintenance of L1 tradition and a shift to L2. Namely, even though 23 informants (60 %) said that their L1 group keeps mostly its L1 tradition and has adopted only some American customs, the majority of them (15) indicated that this is true of the old(er) generation. In contrast, 17 (45 %) responded that the young(er) generation, or everyone in their L1 group, has adopted

American cultural ways, indicating an outgroup trend toward assimilation into L2 community. 13 (34 %) respondents thought that most everybody in their L1 group has already shifted to American ways. It seems, then, that the overall outgroup trend is high (total of 79 %).

Ethno-linguistic value of L1 for one half of the surveyed subjects is an important aspect of their ethnic identity since 50 % declared that their children should speak L1 fluently in the future. 29 %, however, thought that their children should speak L2 better than L1 (choices b. and c.), showing, again, an outgroup trend (18 % said their children should speak L2 as native speakers), but also an overall positive attitude toward bilingualism. Some responses to the open-ended question (30) explain these choices. The main reason for L1 maintenance is preserving L1 and its tradition, while the answers indicating a shift toward L2 were supported by the statements that L1 children should learn English (L2) because they will live here and it will be better for their future; because English is a very important language; and because it's better to be bilingual.

Table 5 (A through H): Perceived Social Comparison to L2 Group

Open-ended questions in this category (7, 8, 27, and 28) elicited responses about L1/L2 mixing. Interlocutor-dependent, the patterns of mixing seem to correlate with levels of formality in usage (social proximity/distance). Greater mixing of L1 with L2 occurs in informal contexts which mark social closeness (with parents, siblings, spouse, cousins, friends), while lower mixing scores appear in more formal contexts, marking social distance (co-workers, classmates, roommates,etc). Convergence to or divergence from

L2, then, is reflected in the degree of formality/distance or informality/intimacy, respectively.

For the majority of the respondents, English is important for communication (55 %), or for work (30 %), which further confirms a domain-based functional orientation and a possible conflict between the desire to maintain L1 and a social need for the use of L2. Comparing L1 culture to the dominant L2 one, most informants thought that it was either moderately different (48 %) or not at all alike (36 %). While 48 % of informants intend to live in the US indefinitely, 26 % hope to go back to their native country soon. The latter may be due to the fact that some respondents were international students who will return to their home country upon the completion of their studies.

Subjects seem to be divided in the way they perceive their L1 culture is evaluated by L2 community. 47 % think that the attitude of Americans toward their L1 group is more positive than negative, whereas 40 % contrast this result with the opinion that Americans have a negative rather than positive attitude toward their L1 group. Giving a reponse on how Americans are perceived by their L1 group, half the subjects 53 % cautiously said that members of the L2 group are somewhat helpful/friendly and concerned about L1 minorities. Responses about the subjects' preferred lifestyle show another divide: a positive evaluation of and a convergence to the L2 way of life (44 %) on the one hand, and a positive evaluation of L1 lifestyle, or a divergence from the one of L2 (40 %), on the other.

Table 6 (A through C): Social Contact/Networking

Results on the informants' multiple group memberships suggest that most of them have a high degree of social contact with other outgroups in which their use of L2 is increased. For example, at work they are mostly with Americans and some foreign born co-workers, or only with Americans (30 %), while 50 % are in school/at work with other nationalities, which prompts them to use L2. Similarly, the majority of the respondents live among Americans or in a neighborhood inhabited mostly by Americans and some foreign nationals (a total 88 %). Only 40 % of all respondents have other types of social contact as members of religious, sports, or community organizations, but this membership in fact confirms their L1 ingroup identity since the organizations are usually church, synagogue, or a similar kind of L1 support group.

Table 7: Attitude Toward L2

In most cases, subjects have positive feelings about L2 and are reasonably comfortable when speaking it. For example, 53 % said they often felt comfortable when speaking English (L2); 60 % like L2 better now than when they only arrived in the US, which shows a positive trend toward acceptance of and convergence to L2. In fact, 37 % of all the informants indicated that they liked English (L2) very much.

6. Discussion of the Results

On the whole, results support Hypothesis 1 by indicating that the bilinguals' L1/L2 choice is primarily functionally motivated, based on the socio-contextual need for the use of one or the other language. However, the choice of L2 or convergence to it can also be seen as a conscious acceptance of the value/status that 'they' code has in the relevant out-group contexts within the 'they' code society. The power of L2 dominance in the society

is mirrored in the social need to use it, which, in turn, tips the balance of power between L1 and L2 for the minority bilingual. 'They' code is not just a social need, it is a powerful social need.

In addition, responses on language mixing reveal that the tension in power relations between L1 and L2 shifts, based on the value assigned to it within the L1 group or in its interaction with L2 group/s. The power of L2 rises in formal, outgroup contexts, but its prestige and social need are lower in the informal ingroup or personalized contexts. In the contexts of intimacy (family, friends, relatives), L2 is abandoned and L1 intrusion is allowed through mixing. As one respondent puts it, "I mix all the time--with my family, boyfriend, friends, and they laugh at me" [for not keeping the languages apart]. Another one says that he "uses English terms when he talks about things he has learned here", indicating lexical borrowing, a form of L1-based convergence to L2. In informal situations, L1 has more power than L2, but since it correlates with closeness and ingroup solidarity, the tolerance for mixing is greater. Mixing persistently even when being laughed at means that the laughter is not an in-group sanction, but rather a sign of in-group intimacy.

Although complex and varied, overall results on the four variables relevant for Hypotheses 2 (a) and 2 (b) show that the respondents' ethno-linguistic enclosure is moderate to high, allowing for a positive evaluation of and a shift to L2 and culture. While the instrumental value of L2 is primary, its integrative value (Gardner 1979) is evident in the general out-group trend across the variables. Namely, ingroup identity is relatively high, but the 'softening' of ingroup boundaries shows in the tendency to leave the group

by marrying into any other group without preference, in the generational shift toward L2 (Milroy and Wei 1995), and in the more positive attitude toward bilingualism, which contradicts Romaine's (1995) observations quoted in the introduction.

Perceived social comparison to the L2 group is a mixed bag of responses, reflecting a conflict in perceptions about the L2 majority group, its lifestyle, and its attitude toward the respondents' native L1 group. Social contact/networking further confirms this tension, especially because 40 % of respondents who are members of different organizations, actually strengthen their in-group bonds and cohesiveness through these in-group memberships. On the other hand, a gradual trend toward the L2 group is evident in the work/school/neighborhood-related contacts (Milroy and Wei 1995). More importantly, the results on the only affective variable about L2 further support this gradual convergence, showing the respondents' mainly positive evaluation of L2.

In terms of the two previously outlined theoretical models, Giles' intergroup approach (Giles and Byrne 1982) and Schumann's acculturation model (Schumann 1976, 1978), results of the survey indicate a general trend toward acculturation, but also a conflict in the values assigned to L1 in relation to L2. It seems difficult to categorize L1 minority bilinguals into two clearly divided categories. While L2 culture is dominant and the bilinguals use L2 in the contexts reflecting social distance, their opinion about the differences/congruence between two cultures, L1 vs. L2 lifestyle, or their attitudes about L2 and culture are not exclusively negative. Schumann's prediction that a good L2 learning situation (convergence to L2) exists where there is less social distance between the L1 and L2 groups doesn't seem to hold. Instead, acculturation/L2 convergence should

be treated as a continuum with varying levels of acceptance of/ resistence to L2 and culture.

Similarly, even though language is an important dimension of in-group identity Giles and Byrne 1982), its choice is a function of a complex power dynamics between the groups. L1 may be a salient group membership feature, in-group vitality may be relatively high, and group members may identify with few outgroup categories, but at the same time in-group boundaries may be porous, and the L1-L2 inter-ethnic comparisons marked by a mix of the L1 group's inferiority and in-group vitality.

In view of the 2 (a) and 2 (b) Hypotheses, the fact that the survey reveals elements of shift to L2, mixed with a conflict between L1 maintenance and convergence to L2, has a direct reflection in the relative power tension between the perceived statuses of L1 and L2 for the minority bilingual. The positively evaluated status of L2, even though it's dominant, contributes to a gradual shift to its acquisition, use, and mixing. Responses to both close-ended and open-ended questions on mixing, however, indicate that most bilinguals freely shift between L1 and L2. It is reasonable to predict that a continued shift, however, will result in more lexical and structural borrowing from L2.

The negatively evaluated status of L2 confirms the desire to maintain L1 and culture. The status of L2 for L1 group members is evaluated as negative if L2 threatens the ethno-linguistic identity of the L1 group, whether L1 is a surviving minority language of a culturally different ethnic group (e.g. Hmong) or a minority L1 of a moderately different cultural group perceived to be in ethno-linguistc competition with the dominant L2 group (e.g. Russian). I will return to this observation in the discussion of Russian and

Hmong L1 respondents in the questionnaire. The survey didn't target obtaining any evidence for pidginization or fossilization ('imperfect' L2 forms); however, as the instructor of many of the surveyed respondents, I can confirm that such cases exist among the linguistically isolated, insecure students, especially if they resist the shift to L2, i.e. show divergence from L2.

The apparent differences in the respondents' judgements about the preservation of L1 and tradition, as well as in their social comparison to the L2 group, underscore the power relations between the two choices. In this respect, the fact that the young generation doesn't absolutely give up its L1 ethno-linguistic identity seems significant. The socio-linguistc power of English (L2) as the dominant language empowers its speakers. Furthermore, its universal linguistic prestige enhances its likely positive dominance for the minority bilinguals, and may have also influenced the positive attitudes about bilingualism. For instance, answers about the language choice in the future generation often contain statements such as "English is a world language, or English is a very important language." On the other hand, "fear of assimilation" (Schumann 1978) disempowers English (L2) in the eyes of the minority bilinguals whose L1 has a vital quality for the ethno-cultural survival of the group. Without a language, the group may lose its authentic ingroup identity, or an important aspect of it. That is the reason why maintenance of L1 has a symbolic ethno-linguistic power for its speakers. The conflict in the socio-linguistic power values of the two languages is further confirmed in the respindents' attitudes toward L2 and culture. Whereas many of them acknowledge the instrumental value of L2 and accept

integration into the dominant L2 culture, they are uncertain of their socio-psychological identity and may fear assimilation (Clement 1980).

This conflict can be illustrated by the results received from the respondents from two L1 minority groups : Russian (N=10) and Hmong (N=7). While most responses are consistent with the overall results, these two groups show some interesting idiosyncracies when one is compared to the other. Most informative in that respect are the answers to the questions about the attitude toward L2 and culture, perceived social comparison to it, and L1 maintenance in the future. While most respondents in both L1 groups find Americans somewhat helpful and concerned about the L1 minorities, 3 Hmong respondents thought that the L2 group doesn't at all care about people like them. These results do not, however, correlate with the responses about the attitude of Americans toward their L1 group/s. As a rule, Russians said that the American attitude toward them is more positive than negative, while Hmong respondents agreed that Americans have a more negative attitude toward them. Even though American culture is in the majority of cases moderately different for Russians and they intend to stay in the US for ever, they either want their children to speak Russian fluently or to become balanced bilinguals. Here is one typical response: " I think that my children should know the language which represent where their parents are from. I also think that a person should speak more than one language and it will be a good choice for my children to learn two languages."

In contrast, Hmong respondents were divided in the response about the cultural differences; half of them found American culture moderately different, and the other half described it as not at all alike. Furthermore, about a half of them, young and some

American-born, hope to go back to their home country soon. Interestingly, they have a split opinion about the L1 maintenance. 4 informants said their children should speak their native language fluently, as illustrated in the following answer: "They [the children] are American, but they should know their own language first before they should go and learn a second language." Conversely, the other 3 respondents thought that their children should speak some Hmong (L1), but should learn to speak English better.

The increase in conflict between the relative values of L1 and L2 for Hmong informants in comparison to the Russians seems to indicate a perceived unavoidable threat to the ethno-linguistic survival of Hmong L1 group, as opposed to a more confident competition of L1 Russian group with the dominant L2 outgroup. Evidently, further analysis should focus on individual L1 groups and the possible quantitative trends they show within each socio-linguistic variable.

7. Conclusion

This survey study suggests that bilinguals' strategies in choosing one of their two languages is socially conditioned in at least two ways. One is a bilingual's functional/ instrumental dependence on one or the other language in the relevant communicative contexts. The other is that, especially in the L2 dominant society (depending on its idiosyncratic socio-cultural, economic, and educational organization), the relative tension between the perceived (and, likely, objective) power of L1 or L2 will lead a bilingual group member in his/her language choice strategy. Based on the value/status of L1/L2 in different social contexts, a minority L1 bilingual chooses to converge to L2 or diverge from it, maintaining L1, separately or in L1/L2 mixing. Although the survey results show

that the choice of L1 and L1-based mixing is more typical of informal contexts and social proximity, there may be formal ingroup contexts which reflect ingroup symbolic solidarity, where L1 choice becomes its important aspect. In her study on the Russian community in Australia, Kouzmin (1988) says the following about the domains of predominantly Russian usage "These are church, social clubs and cultural societies, and community leaders, all of which are characterized by formality, tradition, and ritual" (1988:62).

When the dominant L2 is negatively evaluated as competing with or undermining the value of L1, L2's relative power is subjectified in the perceptions of L1 minority speakers so that it mobilizes the forces of the L1 ingroup identity and the choice of L1 as its crucially important attribute. As Leets and Giles (1995) note in their study on Spanish/English bilinguals in the US, "In fact, when minority groups encounter sociological-even coercive-pressures to disregard their own language (e.g. Soviet Commonwealth), they may be able to withstand this burden and still maintain their language with the appropriate intergroup cognitions and communication climates" (1995:66-7).

Finally, the evaluation of the power relations between L1 and L2 may be an important motivating factor in the learning of a socially dominant L2, as suggested in Giles and Byrne (1982). However, this cannot be the determining motivating factor nor can it be monolithic and absolute. Rather, as the tension in power relations between L1 and L2 moves along the contextual continuum, so does the possible accomodation to L2, its acceptance, anticipated social benefits from choosing it, and its successful learning.

Whereas a power relationship can be conscious or unconscious, acknowledged or unacknowledged, in any power situation, an act of power potentially effects a change.

Admittedly, languages change, but so can attitudes about them. In juggling the perceived imbalance of power, people don't always act the way they say they do. Finally, the perceived relative status of and power relationship between L1 and L2 may change for a bilingual as much as his/her fluency in and the social need for both languages.

References

Beebe, L. and J. Zuengler (1983) "Accomodation theory: an explanation for style shifting in second language dialects."In *SociolinguisticsandLanguageAcquisition*, N.Wolfson and E.Judd, eds. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Beebe, L. and Giles, H. (1984) "Speech-accomodation theories: a discussion in terms of second language acquisition." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 46, 5-32.

Bell, A. (1984) "Language style as audience design." *Language in Society* 13, 145-204.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) "Price formation and the anticipation of profits." *In Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 66-89.

Clement, R. (1980) "Ethnicity, contact, and communicative competence in a second language." In *Language: Social Psychological Perspectives*, Giles, H., W. P. Robinson, and P. M. Smith, eds. Pergamon: Oxford.

Edwards, J. R. (1982) "Language attitudes and their implications among English speakers." In *Attitudes toward language variation: social and applied contexts*, Ryan E. B. and H. Giles, eds. Edward Arnold: London, 20-33.

Gardner, R. (1979) "Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition." In *Language and social psychology*, Giles, H. and R. N. StClair, eds. Blackwell:Oxford.

Giles, H. and P. Smith (1979) "Accomodation theory: optimal levels of convergence." In Language and social psychology. Giles, H. and R. N. StClair, eds. Oxford: Blackwell, 45-65.

Giles, H. and R. N. StClair, eds. (1985) Recent advances in language, communication, & social psychology. Lawrence Erlbaum: London.

Giles, H. and J. L. Byrne (1982) "An intergroup approach to second language acquisition." *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development* 3:1, 17-40.

Graddol, D. and J. Swann (1989) *Gender Voices*. Blackwell: Cambridge.

Gumperz, J. J. (1976) "The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching." *University of California Working Papers* 46. Berkeley: University of California.

Hansen, Doris (1989) *A Study of the Effect of the Acculturation Model on Second Language Acquisition*. (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee).

Kouzmin, L. (1988) "Language use and language maintenance in two Russian communities in Australia." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 72, 51-65.

Lambert, W. E. (1960) "Evaluational reactions to spoken languages." *Journal of abnormal and social psychology*. 60, 44-51.

Leets, L. and H. Giles (1995) "Dimensions of minority language survival/non-survival: intergroup cognitions and communication climates." In *The state of minority languages*, Fase, W., K.Jaspaert, and S. Kroon, eds. *European studies on multilingualism* 5. Swets & Zeitlinger, B. V.: Exton, Pa, 37-73.

Milroy L. and Wei, L. (1995) "A social network approach to code-switching." In *One speaker, two languages*, Milroy, L. and P. Muysken, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 136-157.

Romaine, S. (1995) *Bilingualism*. Blackwell: Oxford & Cambridge.

Schumann, J. H. (1976) "Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition." *Language learning* 26, 135-143.

Schumann, J. H. (1978) "The acculturation model for second language acquisition." In *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching*, R. C. Gingras, ed. Arlington, Va: Center for Applied Linguistics, 27-50.

Appendix 1

UWM Language Use Survey
Please read the questions below and choose the best answers to describe yourself.
Age _____

1. What is your native language ?

2. At what age did you arrive in this country ? When you arrived, did you speak any English ?

3. How long have you been in the U.S. ?

4. (a) What is your occupation ? (If you are a student, state whether you have a job, what kind of work you do, and how many hours a week)

(b) What language do you speak at work ?

5. How many years of formal schooling did you receive in
a) your native country

b) U.S.

6. What (average) percent of your speech is in your native language ?
a. None
b. 5-30 %
c. 30-75 %
d. 75-100 %

7. Do you sometimes **mix** English with your native language when you speak to people who know both your native language and English ? Who are these people (relationship to you, age, occupation) ?

8. On a scale from 1-5, (1= the least, very little; 5= the most, very much), rank the amount of **language mixing** with THREE other (groups) of speakers that you talk to on a daily basis (e.g. parents, brothers/sisters, husband/wife, friends, co-workers, your roomate, etc).

9. What percentage of **time** (or number of hours) <u>every day</u> do you spend speaking
a. English

b. your native language

10. Why is learning to speak English MOST important to you ?
a. To communicate every day
b. To have a job/make a living
c. To talk like other Americans
d. Other (Specify)

11. Who are the people you socialize with (leisure activities, *not* work- or study- related) ?
a. Americans
b. people from my native country
c. mostly from my native country, and some Americans
d. mostly Americans, and some from my native country
e. mostly from my native country, and some from other countries

12. The nationality of my best friends is
a. American
b. the same as mine
c. the same as mine, but they were born in the U.S.
d. different from mine, but they were also foreign-born

13. How would you compare your native country's culture (customs) to American culture (customs) ?
a. similar
b. very similar
c. moderately different
d. not at all alike

14. At work, you are with
a. others from your native country
b. foreign-born, from other countries
c. mostly Americans, some foreign-born

d. Americans
e. if you go to school, say where it is and what language you speak there

15. Which of the following groups primarily lives in your neighborhood ?
a. others from my native country
b. foreign-born, from other countries
c. mostly Americans, some foreign-born
d. almost all Americans

16. How long do you intend to stay in America ?
a. I hope to get back to my home country soon
b. up to 5 years
c. up to 10 years
d. for ever

17. What do you think is the attitude of Americans toward people from your native country ?
a. Positive
b. More positive than negative
c. More negative than positive
d. Negative

18. Which **best** describes your feelings toward Americans ?

a. Helpful, friendly, concerned about people like me
b. Somewhat helpful, friendly, and concerned about people like me
c. More helpful and concerned than most long-time immigrants from my country
d. Not very helpful/friendly--they don't care about people like me

19. As a group, how have people from your native country responded to American ways, values, beliefs ? (**Please specify** : *all, or older generation, or young generation*).
a. They keep our native ways and have not adopted American ways
b. They have adopted mostly American ways and still keep some native ways
c. They have completely adopted American ways and no longer keep our native ways
d. They keep mostly our native ways and have adopted only some American ways

20. How do people in your native group use language (*all, or older generation, or young generation*)?
a. They think it's important to keep the native language, and they speak it most of the time
b. They think it's important to speak both languages, and they often mix their languages freely
c. They want to keep the native language; they mix it with English only sometimes, and then it sounds like my native language
d. They think it's important to learn English. If they mix my native language with English, there are more English sounds and words in it

21. What style of living do you prefer ?
a. American
b. More American than my native country
c. More my native country than American
d. My native country (not American)

22. **How** do you feel when you speak English ?
a. Very comfortable
b. Often comfortable
c. Often embarrassed
d. Very uncomfortable

23. If you are not married, would you marry someone
a. From your native country
b. American-born, but from the same country/culture
c. American-born or foreign-born, but of a different nationality
d. American
e. No preference
f. I am already married to_____

24. What are your feelings **about** English ?
a. I like it very much
b. I like it better now than I did when I first arrived in the U.S.
c. I don't like it, but I have to learn it to function in this country
d. I feel very frustrated about it, and I wish I didn't have to learn it at all

25. Describe THREE situations in which you ALWAYS use English .
1.

2.

3.

26. Describe THREE situations in which you ALWAYS use your native language.
1.

2.

3.

27. When do you **mix** your native language and English **the most** ?

a. In every-day conversations with my friends or people who are the same age as I am

b. In every-day conversations with my family
c. In conversations with people who are older than me and don't speak English very well
d. In conversations with my co-workers (fellow-students)
e. At church, cultural gatherings, meetings, or when I visit with the people from my native group regardless of their age
f. Same as (e), but only with the younger generation
g. Other (Specify)

28. Do you sometimes speak English with the people who can also speak your native language ? When and with whom ?

29. In the future, do you think that your children should
a. Speak your native language fluently
b. Speak some of your native language, but should speak English better
c. Speak some of your native language if they want, but they should learn to speak English as other Americans

30. Please say WHY you have chosen the answer above (a., b., or c.).

31. Please list 1-3 organizations you belong to (church, club, or other). Do you like going to the meetings ? Why ?

Appendix 2

Table 1: Language Dominance

Average % of speech in L1	none	30-75 %	75-100 %
Percentage of respondents		68 %	32 %
Daily % of time speaking L1		20-40 %	
Daily % of time speaking L2			60-80 %
Domains of L1 use	home-related conversations and activities in translation with friends and elderly L1 speakers for verbalization of emotions and thoughts		
Domains of L2 use	school/work shopping recreation centers/sports communication with L2 speakers and international friends		

Tables 2-4: Ethno-Linguistic Enclosure

Table 2

A People you socialize with		B Nationality of best friends	
L2	0 %	L2	8 %
L1	18 %	L1	82 %
mostly L1	45 %	L1 but born in US	5 %
mostly L2	21 %	foreign-born/other L's	5 %
mostly L1 and foreign nationals	16 %		

Table 3

C In-group socio-cultural response to dominant ways, values, beliefs		D L1 in-group use of language	
preserved L1	8 %	L1	30 %
mostly adopted L2	45 %	L1/L2 free mixing	50 %
completely adopted L2	34 %	L1-base mixing	10 %
mostly preserved L1	60 %*	L2-base mixing	10 %

*Some respondents combined this response with the first option

Table 4

E Marriage preference		F L1 maintenance	
L1 in-group	58 %	children should speak L1 fluently	50 %
L2	5 %	children should speak some L1, but should speak L2 better	29 %
L2 or another out-group	2 %	children should speak some L1 if they want, but should speak L2 as native speakers	18 %
		children should be equally fluent in both languages	3 %
no preference	35 %		

Table 5: Perceived Social Comparison to L2 Group

A Instrumental value of L2		B Comparison of L1 culture to L2 culture	
every day communication	55 %	similar	16 %
get work/make a living	30 %	very similar	0 %
to speak like L2 native speakers	5 %	moderately different	48 %
other (studying)	10 %	not at all alike	36 %
C Projected length of stay in US		D Attitude of dominant L2 outgroup toward L1 group	
will go back to native country soon	26 %	positive	8 %
up to 5 years	10 %	more positive than negative	47 %
up to 10 years	13 %	more negative than positive	40 %
for ever	48 %	negative	5 %
undecided	3 %		
E Individual feelings about dominant L2 group		F Preferred lifestyle	
concerned about L1 group	10 %	L2 culture	8 %
somewhat concerned about L1 group	53 %	more L2 than L1 culture	44 %
more helpful than long-term L1 residents	21 %	more L1 than L2 culture	40 %
they are not at all concerned about L1 group	13 %	L1 culture	8 %
no response	3 %		

G Highest % of mixing L1 and L2		H Sometimes use only L2 with other L1/L2 bilinguals	
conversations with the same generation bilinguals	48 %	YES	80 %
conversations with family	15 %	NO	20 %
conversations with elderly L1 speakers	8 %		
conversations with co-workers	3 %		
at L1 social gatherings	13 %		
at L1 social gatherings, but only with younger generation	3 %		
other	10 %		

Table 6: Social Contact/Networking

A Social contact/networking		B Social contact in the neighborhood	
others from L1 group	0 %	others from L1 group	5 %
foreign-born, from other out-groups	50 %	foreign born, from other out-groups	8 %
mostly L2 speakers	30 %	mostly L2 speakers	34 %
L2 speakers	20 %	nearly all L2 speakers	53 %
C Group memberships			
in-group memberships/ organizations	40 %		
out-group memberships/ organizations			
none	20 %		

Table 7: Attitude Toward L2 (+ L2 = positive; - L2 = negative)

+ L2		- L2	
Feel when speaking L2			
A very comfortable	16 %	C often embarrassed	26 %
B often comfortable	53 %	D very uncomfortable	5 %
Attitude ABOUT L2			
A like it very much		C only has a needed function	26 %
B like it better now than upon arrival in US	60 %	D very negative	0 %